

Appn No. 10/815,649  
Amdt. Dated May 9, 2006  
Response to Office Action of March 22, 2006

12

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Office Action dated March 22, 2006.

**Specification**

An amended abstract is filed herewith.

**Claim Amendments**

Claim 1 has been amended to specify an IR light source in place of the laser source. Basis for this amendment can be found throughout the specification as filed (see, for example, page 78, lines 18-20; claim 23).

The subject-matter of claims 4 and 18 has been incorporated into claim 1. Claims 4 and 18 have been cancelled.

**Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102**

It is submitted that the subject-matter of claim 1 is not anticipated by the disclosure of Nagasaki. In his Office Action, the Examiner makes reference to column 14, lines 10-17 of Nagasaki in support of his assertion that this document teaches optic components formed on a monolithic integrated circuit.

However, Nagasaki fails to teach incorporating timing circuitry onto the same monolithic integrated circuit as the photodetector.

As explained at page 79, lines 11-18 of the present specification, the reason for incorporating the image sensor and image processor onto the same integrated circuit is to minimize the requirements for high-speed external interfacing from the image sensor. This external interfacing represents a 'bottle-neck' in data transfer and, therefore, the speed at which the scanning device can capture and process images.

By providing timing circuitry on the same monolithic integrated circuit as the image sensor, fewer demands are placed on external interfacing and, consequently, faster image capture and processing can be achieved.

Stumm fails to address the problem of increasing the speed of image capture and processing. Moreover, Stumm fails to suggest the presently claimed solution of incorporating timing circuitry onto the same monolithic integrated circuit as the image sensor. It appears from column 14, lines 10-17 that Stumm is only concerned with the size of his device, and not the speed at which it operates.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the skilled person would have been unable to arrive at the present invention, having read the disclosure of Stumm. It is therefore submitted that all claims meet the requirements of 35 USC § 102 & 103.

Appln No. 10/815,649  
Amdt. Dated May 2, 2006  
Response to Office Action of March 22, 2006

13

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections have been successfully traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,  
Applicants:


  
KIA SILVERBROOK

  
PAUL LAPSTUN

  
JAN RUSMAN

  
PETER CHARLES BOYD HENDERSON

  
ALIREZA MOINI

  
ZHENYA ALEXANDER YOURLO

  
MATTHEW JOHN UNDERWOOD

  
NICHOLAS DAMON RIDLEY